

New York Tribune  
First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.  
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 23, 1916.  
Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, Inc., New York, corporation, capital stock, \$1,000,000. President, G. V. Vorse; Vice-President, Richard H. Wallis; Secretary, John J. McManus; Treasurer, Thomas H. Sullivan; 134 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone, Beckman 3000.  
SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York:  
Daily & Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.00; 3 mos. \$2.50; 6 mos. \$4.50; 1 year, \$8.00.  
Daily & Sunday, 6 mos. \$4.50; 1 year, \$8.00.  
Daily & Sunday, 1 year, \$8.00.  
Daily only, 6 mos. \$2.50; 1 year, \$4.50.  
Sunday only, 6 mos. \$1.50; 1 year, \$2.50.  
Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.  
You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

The Bulgarian Advance on Kavala.

Exactly as in the case of the Italian expedition to Salonica, it is the political rather than the military aspect of the Bulgarian advance upon Kavala that claims first attention. Were the Allies contemplating an attack upon Bulgaria, and ultimately upon Turkey, by the coast of the Aegean, the occupation of the Drama and Kavala districts of Greece by the Bulgarians would have a real military importance, but no such attack is under consideration. The Allies are bending all their energies to get north, not east. And it may be recalled that in 1913, at the time of the Second Balkan War, the victories of the Greeks north and west of Kavala, the success at Kilkis and the capture of Seres, which seems to-day again menaced from the west, determined a Bulgarian retirement from the district between the Struma and Mesta rivers.

But on the political side the value to the Bulgarians of Kavala is plain. To understand the Bulgarian mind it is necessary to go back to the Treaty of San Stefano, when Russia, having defeated the Turk, created that Greater Bulgaria which was destroyed by the subsequent Congress of Berlin, but remained in the heart of every Bulgarian the definite prophecy for his nation's future. By the Treaty of San Stefano Bulgaria received all the territory between the Mesta and the Struma, including Kavala. She received also all of Macedonia, up to the frontiers of Serbia, as they existed before the First Balkan War. In addition she received Nish, Pirot and Vranja, which were allotted to the Serb at Berlin.

In the First Balkan War Bulgaria and Serbia made an ante-bellum agreement partitioning Macedonia. Serbia received Skopje (Ushub) and the territory north of a line drawn from the old Serbo-Bulgarian frontier north of Kustendil to Lake Ochrida. Bulgaria received the rest of Macedonia, including the towns of Veles, Monastir, Ochrida and Istib. No arrangement was made before the war between the Greek and the Bulgarian, and in consequence there was a race between the two both for Salonica and for Kavala. Greece won both, but in the negotiations that followed Venizelos quite wisely consented to cede to Bulgaria the territory east of the Struma, the districts of Drama and Kavala.

For the Bulgarians the value of Kavala is plain. It is the only possible port for all of Western Bulgaria. It is situated directly south of Sofia, and down the Struma Valley a railroad could be constructed from Kustendil, the present railroad, giving Bulgaria a commercial outlet. Kavala is the only real harbor along this shore. Dedeagach, now Bulgarian, is but an open roadstead, and it is connected with Bulgaria by a railroad which runs along the edge of the fortifications of Adrianople. In point of fact, it ran through Turkish territory until the eve of the present conflict, when Bulgaria received the strip of Turkish territory west of the Maritza as a price for joining the Central Powers.

When Bulgaria decided, spurred on by Austria, to attack the Serbs and Greeks in the Second Balkan War, her armies were driven out of the Drama and Kavala districts by the Greeks and out of all Macedonia by the Serbs. By the Treaty of Bucharest she lost all of Macedonia, and in addition Greek possession of Kavala and Drama was confirmed. As the Turks took back Adrianople, Bulgaria was thus cut off from any real access to the sea, and of her conquests of the First Balkan War she preserved little but the shore of the Aegean between the mouths of the Maritza and the Mesta.

It was to restore her situation that Bulgaria entered the present war. In her campaign against Serbia she conquered, with German and Austrian aid, all of Macedonia and occupied all the territories which had been assigned to her by the Treaty of San Stefano, save only for the regions assigned to Greece by the Treaty of Bucharest. But all of these territories did not suffice, because Bulgaria was still excluded from an Aegean port and Bulgarian eyes had been firmly fixed upon Salonica and Kavala.

Venizelos, rightly recognizing that Bulgaria meant to have the two Greek towns, endeavored to persuade his King in 1915 to stand with the Serbs and fulfill their agreement of 1913. But Constantine, wholly under Teutonic influence and expecting the victory of the Central Powers, declined. He had the guarantee of his brother-in-law, the Kaiser, that Greece would not be deprived of any territory by the Bulgarians and that the Central Powers would stay their advance at the Greek frontier.

For a time this situation did prevail. But now it is plain that the Bulgarians have made the occupation of Kavala one of the conditions of remaining in the war. In other words, Bulgaria, recognizing that she will have to bear the brunt of the

Allied offensive in the Balkans, has demanded that she be permitted to occupy Kavala and thus complete the work of restoring the Greater Bulgaria of the Treaty of San Stefano. And the Central Powers have had, perforce, to consent.

As for the Allies, they are not in the least concerned about the Kavala district. If the Greeks do not desire to defend it for themselves then the Bulgarians may occupy it so far as Paris, London or Petrograd is concerned. But the position of King Constantine is rendered exceedingly difficult by the Bulgarian action. His own countrymen upheld him when he declined to support Venizelos in a bargain with the Bulgarians, engineered by the Allies last summer, by which Greece would cede the Kavala and Drama districts to Bulgaria and receive the Allied promise to have Smyrna and the western shore of Asia Minor after the war. This was a portion of Sir Edward Grey's preposterous scheme to restore the Balkan alliance, which he had himself wrecked at the Conference of London in 1912, when he accepted the Austrian plan for Albania.

Now Bulgaria is taking possession of the Kavala region, where Bulgarian atrocities in the Second Balkan War called forth the famous public declaration of King Constantine himself. He has the pledge of the Kaiser that the occupation will be temporary, but his own countrymen will not credit this pledge because they know of the long standing determination of the Bulgars, and they recognize that Bulgaria will henceforth be able to make its own terms with the Central Powers.

Thus on the eve of a general election in Greece Constantine is being very seriously handicapped by the action of the Bulgars. What Venizelos forecast has now taken place. It has taken place with the connivance of Constantine, who has ordered the Greek troops in the Kavala district to retire before the Bulgarian invader, and a considerable portion of Hellenic territory is now actually in Bulgarian hands, territory that the Bulgars has long claimed and after the Second Balkan War swore to reconquer.

On the other hand, the coming of the Italian raises an equally difficult question. It was Italian opposition that compelled Greece to forego the annexation of Northern Epirus after the First Balkan War and to evacuate Koritza, Argirocastro and Santi Quaranta. These towns have been recaptured and representatives from them sit in the Greek Boule. But it is well understood that this is only a temporary situation, and Italy may be expected to demand that they be evacuated again when the war ends, if she can then have her way.

The policy of Constantine has kept his country out of war so far, but it is now beginning to be apparent that it has done so only at the cost of Hellenic territory and Albanian territory occupied by the Greeks, which, had Greece joined the Allies, would have been conceded to her. He has also made impossible of realization for all time, it would seem, the old Greek dream of reconquering the Hellenic settlements on the west coast of Asia Minor, to defend which Greece risked the great Persian war, which brought Marathon and the beginning of the glory of Ancient Greece.

What the effect of all this will be upon the Greek voter when the October elections come may be problematical. Much will depend upon the progress of the Allied offensive by that time, perhaps. But it is highly unlikely that the Allies will make any effort to get the Bulgars out of Kavala, and it is within the bounds of possibility that they may, presently, consent to permanent Bulgarian possession here if the Bulgars should change sides. That the Allies would offer no objection to Bulgarian retention of both the Kavala-Drama district, now Greek, and the Serbian territory in Macedonia east of the Vardar, is certain, and Bulgaria, after some weeks or months of fighting against the British, French, Italian and Serbian troops, with little help from Austria and Germany, may be willing, for money considerations, also to change her alignment, even at the cost of the surrender of Monastir and Skopje.

Constantine's policy was predicated upon the success of Germany. He has staked his throne on this calculation and he has risked his country's future. If his calculation proves wrong, then the costs to his country will be great. Then only by depositing him and calling Venizelos to the helm could the Greeks hope to save themselves from the wrath of the Allies, from the ambitions of the Bulgars and from the anger of the Serb. From every aspect, therefore, the Bulgarian advance on Kavala is both interesting and significant.

As to the coming of the Russians, newly announced, the moral effect is again most important. At last the Bulgars will have to fight the nation which freed them, and the Greeks and Bulgars alike will have ocular evidence that the Allies have the men and the will to settle the Eastern Question.

Further Restrictions on Thieves.

A curious example of the difficulty of shaping laws in a permanent way—or an example, it might rather be said, of the possibility of rubbing on for many years with anomalous laws—is shown in some recommendations by a committee of legislators lately appointed in England to consider the defects of the larceny laws. One of the suggestions is to do away with the archaic common law distinction between animals fit for food and animals unfit for food.

The absurdities of the distinction are easily demonstrated. For instance, as the law stands, one who steals a pet lark may be prosecuted, but a canary—a commoner and more probable object of thievery—cannot be stolen because a canary is not counted as a bird fit for food. Bees may be stolen, but only because they are expressly excepted among the animals unfit for the food of man, and so, too, falcons and hawks. It is doubtful, however, whether a wild bird or even a wild bird's

eggs, however valuable, can be stolen, the question according to common law depending on the edibility of the bird.

It is now suggested that, with certain exceptions, "everything which has value and is the property of any person, and if adhering to the reality then after severance therefrom, shall be capable of being stolen." So the collectors of such varieties as the eggs of the great auk may in time feel secure in their possessions.

Are the Railroads Criminals?

President Wilson appealed to the railroad executives "as one American citizen to another to avert this disaster"—the threatened general railroad strike. If he had appealed with equal fervor to the representatives of the employees, before publicly espousing their cause, it would have been vastly more fair and might have been more effective.

The immediate threat of disaster—and that is no exaggerated term to apply to it—comes not from the railroad executives, but from the brotherhoods. It is they who have refused arbitration—who have refused anything save unconditional surrender to their demands. And it is the President who, by indorsing their demands and using all his powers of persuasion, and the prestige of his office, in supporting them, has confirmed the unionists in their position.

That position is wrong. It is unsound economically. It is the experience from years of labor troubles in all lines of industry that the surest way of progress toward substantial justice for employers and employees, toward stability of business, toward safeguarding the rights of the general public, lies through arbitration. It has been regarded by social reformers as a triumph every time a settlement of labor trouble has been obtained by give-and-take methods rather than by the wasteful violence of the strike or lockout. President Wilson himself, in his speedy denial of antagonism to the principle, and in his semi-official talk about the passage of a compulsory arbitration law akin to Canada's, admits the merit of it. But in this particular instance—as important as any that could ever come before the country—he deliberately and persistently sets his face against that which he says is good, and by that very act upholds the hands of the union leaders, who threaten violence.

The meanest criminal in this country has his day in court as his right. All the railroad executives ask for the vast interests they represent is a day in court. All the public asks is that the two sides of the case be spread fairly, accurately, impartially, on the records. This President Wilson has denied to the railroad executives and to the public—not only to that substantial portion of the public which is employed by the railroads but does not belong to the "Big Four," and that large part of the public which has invested its capital in railroad securities, but to the business man whose trade depends on transportation and the householder whose food depends on it.

"I am willing to allow this matter to go to the great American jury and let them assess the responsibility," says the President. His actions give the lie to his words. If he really had been willing he would not have recommended that the men's demands be granted before arbitration. He would have insisted to the brotherhoods that they submit their claims to investigation by the Interstate Commerce Commission or some other official agency—if necessary one specially created—as the railroad heads were willing to do. Then the facts would have been laid, officially, before the "great American jury." Then the public would have been able to fix the responsibility.

Now all it knows is that capital takes an intelligent and enlightened stand, while labor takes an unsound, selfish, arbitrary stand, and the President of the United States backs up labor. Even the President's advocacy of the brotherhoods' case cannot win it favor with the public under these conditions. The sooner the unions and the President recognize that and set about it to right the great mistake they have made the sooner the public will feel free of the menace of a grave disaster.

Limits of Physical Training.

(From The Medical Record.)

The tendency toward physical training, as well as its specialized form, military training, does not aim so much at the increase of the actual physical power as at the increase of the reserve power. The former, no matter how small, is usually sufficient to maintain ordinary bodily needs. But the ordinary muscular force is wholly inadequate to sustain any unusual demands of the body, whether from disease or otherwise, and against which the body must be prepared. The latter speak of the increase of reserve force as "hardening" process. Under this conception it is believed that any hardship or discomfort increases the body reserve, and that the more suffering and hardship the better. The more comfort and ease under which one lives, the less reserve force there is developed—because not needed—and the "softer" they become. Hardening is exercise of the wholesome kind against resistance. It must, however, be done with an eye on the actual powers of the body. The amount of fatigue must never rise beyond a point where the fatigue products can be easily absorbed and the body recuperate. Otherwise, whatever increase of power there is will be actual and needed to drive a less easily running human engine. There may be increased muscular power, but it will be bound—"muscle bound"—to the actual needs of the body.

The Oyster Set.

(From The Hartford Daily Courant.)

According to the talk of the oystermen, it will make little difference whether 1916 has a single month with an "r" in it or whether it sticks to the customary number. They say that the oyster set this summer is very poor, and their assertion follows one by Clerk Frederick L. Perry of the shellfish commission to the effect that the set of oyster is very satisfactory. Mr. Perry is an expert in the matter, but as are the men who say the set is poor, and they outnumber him, and, besides, the probabilities are against him because this set, if there is one, immediately precedes a season of the Legislature. If any calamity is to befall the oyster industry it is bound to arrive just before the Legislature does, and in a more or less diffident way the oystermen mention it when the question of the taxation of oyster ground is brought up.

HALF COCKED

The President's Attitude Toward Settlement of the Railroad Controversy.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: President Wilson has a positive genius for getting into great questions wrong end to, or, to use a homely phrase, for going off half cocked. This tendency was never more strongly manifested than in connection with the threatened strike on the railroads. Here was a case where a judicial demeanor was pre-eminently called for.

A judge on the bench before announcing a decision in any case (important or otherwise) listens to the testimony, hears the arguments of counsel on both sides and often calls for briefs outlining the main points in dispute. With deliberation he considers the case in all its aspects before reaching a conclusion.

The case of the brotherhoods representing the trainmen and the managers representing the railroads is of almost colossal importance to the welfare of the nation.

How does the President handle it? He listens to the trainmen's story, and, no doubt, with the labor vote in an eight hour day, and urges the railroads to grant it and then arbitrates the minor points or submit to the rulings of a commission appointed by him. And all this in the face of the fact that the eight hour day was about all the men asked for—the very meat of their demands. It was even suggested that the railroad managers should give his plan, which would involve the reorganization of the railroad system of the whole country, a trial—as they might try out a new style of automobile.

Nothing could better illustrate the lack of business instinct in Mr. Wilson than this thoroughly impracticable suggestion.

The railroads have indicated their willingness to arbitrate the entire question, but the men seem only willing to arbitrate when about all they want has been conceded in advance. If the cause of the trainmen is a just one they will lose nothing by arbitration—if unjust, there is all the more reason for insisting upon arbitration.

M. T. R.  
New York, Aug. 21, 1916.

How to Settle the Railway Dispute.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The railroad difficulty might be adjusted by a practical application of horse sense—fix a flat rate per diem, without regard to distance as constituting a day.

Take as an example any of the through roads to constitute eight hours as a day. Starting your crew from Buffalo—would you have them leave the train between Hudson and Poughkeepsie? Starting your crew from Pittsburgh, would you have them leave the train midway between Harrisburg and Wilmington?

If you fix an eight hour day it would be necessary to apportion the route that an entire change of crew would be made at a central station that would, as now fixed, claim their time for about six hours on any one of the through lines, making part of two days to make one of actual service of eight hours, time to be computed from time of register, not from time of leaving home to report—all of which, with less complication, is overcome by the flat rate per diem.

Let such rate be pro rata to the present prevailing wage, with sufficient addition to make even dollars. The writer approves somewhat the Ford auto plan, which maintains a minimum and a maximum rate, and likewise the railroads could do so, thus reaching all classes.

Arbitration under the Newlands act would not avail. Nor could the Interstate reach a just basis until the overcapitalization was eliminated, for it is this feature that is the base of the railroads' contention that the earnings of the roads do not warrant a higher rate of pay. It is not a hard problem to solve on either side, that by first deducting an interest rate for the excess of overcapitalization and providing for a 1-1-4 to 2-1-4 quarterly dividend, the wage must suffer. One needs only to refer to Pullman—cut 10 per cent deduction of wage and the following week a 2-1-4 dividend.

The employees know these facts, but to a man they would vote a flat rate commensurate with time and overtime, and the roads could well afford that.

Let President Wilson meet the suggestion in lieu of his proposition for eight hours, fix a time to adjust, within reason, and all grounds for a strike now or hereafter will disappear.

W. B. S.  
New York, Aug. 21, 1916.

"A Real Public Service."

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The editorial so headed in your issue of August 19, 1916, is a sure, meet the approval of nearly every reader of The Tribune. And all these readers sympathize with England and the Allies in this war, and the same is true of practically all the Republican voters in this state. Therefore Robert Bacon will be the logical candidate on the Republican ticket for United States Senator. With him in the Senate the cause of the Allies will be sure to have a square deal in this country.

And such a change would be a great satisfaction to those who have been exasperated beyond measure at the way in which the "German mole" has been allowed to burrow into the politics of this country. The most powerful aid in this burrowing is the vast army of aliens dumped on our shores in recent years. By subsidizing the foreign language press and having friends in the foreign societies in this country the German government has exercised a dangerous influence in our politics and legislation. Since the opening of this war the same influence has been seen in plots to blow up our manufacturing plants, to hamstring our productive capacity, and in inciting strikes.

As these aliens have thus been Germany's most powerful aid, it follows that a good share of the responsibility for their devilry should rest with those men in Congress who have opposed all legislation that was designed to prevent the dumping of such aliens on our shores. And one of these men is William M. Calder. During the whole time that he was in Congress Mr. Calder was actively on the side of German steamship lines in opposing the restriction of immigration. Mr. Calder is Mr. Bacon's opponent for the Republican nomination for United States Senator, and for his services in Congress, as well as for his milk and water attitude on current international issues, he will doubtless get what foreign votes the steamship lobby can control. But the real American citizens, who are in sympathy with England, France, Italy and Belgium in this war, and who believe in the success of the English speaking race, will vote for Robert Bacon for United States Senator.

W. H. ALLEN.  
Brooklyn, Aug. 21, 1916.

The Real Owners of the Railroads.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: When they went proxies for an annual meeting the executives of the railroads seem to have no difficulty in reaching all their stockholders very expeditiously, even if at other times we are in the category of Commodore Vanderbilt's public. Why, then, don't they circulate all their stockholders on the question of arbitration? It seems to me that if they obtained (as they probably would) the support of some millions of the actual owners of their roads, it would not only strengthen their stand very considerably, but would also give Mr. Wilson something to ponder over from a vote-winning point of view.

J. A. L.  
New York, Aug. 21, 1916.



MR. BAKER'S ATTEMPTED DEFENCE.

The Democratic Raid Upon the Philippine Judiciary Stands Defended Only by Irrelevant and Immaterial Statements—Governor Gilbert Did Not Recommend the Vicious Reorganization Act.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The Honorable War Secretary comes again in "The Times" of the 14th with a jumble of his own opinions, excerpts from old laws and irrelevant and immaterial statements that establish no essential facts, throw no light on the questions involved and reflect no credit on the author. The merit of this interview consists of important admissions.

Mr. Baker's client was guilty of "vicious" legislation.

I had only charged his client with a sin of omission. Now Mr. Baker admits a sin of commission when he practically concedes that Mr. Harrison approved the legislative act in question and thereby "upheld civil service" and became the great benefactor of the Philippine judiciary.

Mr. Baker's assumption or contention that I should not attack Governor Harrison's administration in his absence unless I had a personal grievance is no more reasonable than if he were to contend that Mr. Hughes and Colonel Roosevelt should not in California assail President Wilson for his maladministration unless they have personal grievances against Mr. Wilson. For, mark you, Mr. Baker says there was no "emergency" to warrant my attack. Therefore, according to Mr. Baker, none of Mr. Harrison's numerous asinine laws have a right to assail him, because he is far away and they have no personal grievances.

I am a free, native-born American citizen, and without any "emergency" or "personal grievance" whatever, have a perfect moral and legal right to criticize the official acts and policies of Governor Harrison or any other public servant so long as I do not abuse the privilege. Newspapers exercise this same unquestioned legal right.

The War Secretary now admits that acting Governor Gilbert did not recommend the passage of the reorganization act, though in the first challenge he asserted that Mr. Gilbert did. I now challenge the Honorable Secretary to show that any Governor General prior to Mr. Harrison ever recommended this "vicious" act.

And be it remembered that I have not asserted that Mr. Gilbert and Mr. Araneta had not approved this act, but only that Mr. Baker had not shown it. It is immaterial whether Mr. Araneta did or did not approve it.

My proposition is that no Governor General except Mr. Harrison either approved or allowed such an unwise act to pass the commission, although it may have passed the lower house.

My declaration was that this act was a blunder and lessened the efficiency of the judiciary, and that Governor Harrison could have prevented its passage if he had wished to do so, but that he did not for the reasons stated.

Mr. Baker admits that this act failed to become law during prior administrations, although, with some modifications, it had passed the lower house of the Legislature, composed entirely of Filipinos. Nobody contends that the majority of Filipino lawmakers have not always desired radical changes in the judiciary and the government service generally. Many of them would be delighted to have all the Americans get out of the islands at once.

But the truth is that this act failed of passage before Mr. Harrison's day for the simple reason that there were a wise, non-partisan and experienced Governor (Mr. Forbes) and commission to check its enactment into law. Mr. Harrison, however, made no effort to prevent its approval by the commission or its passage in the lower house. If he had, doubtless he would have succeeded. Indeed, Mr. Baker substantially admits that Mr. Harrison had no desire to check it, but that "what Mr. Harrison did" was a "striking case of upholding the spirit

GERMAN LOSSES

They Far Exceed the Increase from New Recruits.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The fallacy that appears in the letter of Mr. Theodore H. Saal, dated August 15, 1916, and printed in The Tribune of August 19, 1916, is one that needs to be exposed. He like many others, seeks to cancel the German casualties mentioned in the statement of the British government by placing against them the total number of new recruits who come of military age during the same period.

Independent of war or peace, the German army, like all other armies, loses each year nearly as many men by death, illness, accidents and retirement from old age as it receives in new recruits. The army, where universal service obtains, increases annually in peace times in direct proportion to the country's growth in population and no faster.

The process is like pouring water into a pail which has a hole at the bottom, allowing the water in the pail to escape nearly as fast as it is poured in. The result is that the level of the water rises, but very slowly. But punch a second hole in the bottom of the pail of about the same size as the first and the level of the water in the pail is bound to stop rising and will sink at a rapid rate. In addition to the normal losses suffered in peace times, represented by the first hole in the bottom of the pail, which almost equalize the annual number of recruits, the German army is now suffering war losses, represented by the second hole in the bottom of the pail, which in themselves are at least nearly equal to the yearly accessions of new troops. For practical purposes it is therefore accurate to say that the effective strength of the German army has been reduced by approximately the numbers mentioned in the British statement, making due allowances for the high percentage of wounded who recover sufficiently to return to the front.

It is probably true that the normal losses in peace times and the strictly war losses are not mutually exclusive, but if the overlap somewhat the grand total would scarcely be much lessened.

Mr. Saal's conclusion that the German army, in spite of all losses, is actually increasing at the rate of 240,000 men in two years reduces his whole argument to an absurdity. The rate of growth of the army in peace times, based on 10 per cent of the annual increment of the population, is scarcely that high. Mr. Saal's figures prove too much.

FRANK R. GREENE.  
New York, Aug. 21, 1916.

The One-Term Plank.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: A letter signed by some individual calling himself "Citizenship" appears in your issue of August 17. This man appears very indignant because President Wilson has the audacity to run for a second term, while according to "Citizenship" his party pledged him to a single term.

I should think it was your duty as one of the leading papers of the greatest city in our country to see that the public are not misled by reading articles which, if springing originally from some element of truth, have been so changed that they give an impression absolutely different from what the genuine statement was intended for.

What I refer to is the plank in the Democratic platform which refers to the single term which that party favored. The exact words are as follows: "We favor a single Presidential term, and to that end urge the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution making the President of the United States ineligible for reelection, and we pledge the candidate of this convention to this principle." That any man with average intelligence could read into this statement anything that implied that President Wilson pledged himself not to run for a second time is utterly out of the question. I am sure that the gentleman who was so outraged at his so doing has been deceived concerning the facts. What this plank meant was that the Democratic party and its candidate approved a single term for all Presidents and would favor such an amendment. Nothing can be found to bind the Democratic candidates or even inhibit the Democratic candidate or even prevent him that he would not run for the second term, for whatever reasons that might prevent it, the amendment failed to pass or even be proposed.

JESSE HOYT.  
Northeast Harbor, Me., Aug. 18, 1916.

Specifications Wanted.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: May I inquire who is Francis Parker, the writer of so sweeping a condemnation of all the butter in the market and on our tables in The Tribune of yesterday? Exact data are in order, it seems to me.

MRS. ALBERT ERDMAN.  
Orient, L. I., Aug. 18, 1916.